

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claim 11 stands objected to because of an alleged informality.

Claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,008) (hereinafter “Beckert”).

Claims 10, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010 B1) (hereinafter “Berstis”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application’s specification. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 remain currently pending for consideration.

Objection to Claim 11

Claim 11 stands objected to because of an alleged informality. In particular, the Office Action states that “software for capturing said arbitrary display data” should be changed to -- software for capturing [said] a arbitrary display data.-- Accordingly, claim 11 has been newly-amended in response to the comments at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. A minor change to the Examiner’s recommended amendment has been made to improve the grammatical form of the claim by replacing the Examiner’s suggested “a arbitrary” with --an arbitrary.-- Withdrawal of the objection to claim 11 is thus respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beckert. Claims 10, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beckert in view of Berstis. Applicants have amended claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner asserts that Beckert meets the instant application's claimed feature of "wherein said storage part is contained in a display panel portion of said electronic equipment" (lines 7-8 of claim 1) "because the base 46 (fig. 1)/support module 62 (fig. 3) is interpreted by the Examiner to contain a display panel portion."

The Examiner goes on to point out in the Advisory Action that Applicants allegedly fail "to define the relationship between the display panel and the display panel portion in the claims." The Examiner asserts further that "there is nothing in the claim that defines the display panel as being contained in the display panel portion, so that Examiner interprets the Beckert reference to teach the memory (110, 133, 132)/storage part contained in the base 46/support module 62/display panel portion to be enabled to write into the memory when the faceplace 60 (fig. 3)/display panel is detached from the device body portion (also contained in the base 46/support module 62) ... as required by claim 1."

In light of the Examiner's helpful suggestions in this regard, Applicants have opted to amend independent claim 1 of the instant application along the lines of the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, independent claim 1 of the instant application now describes a

combination of features of a display apparatus for use with an electronic equipment having a display panel portion containing a display panel for displaying images. The combination of features includes a storage part contained in said electronic equipment for storing display data representing display images to be displayed on said display panel; and a data writing part for receiving display data from the outside of said electronic equipment to write into said storage part as said display data. In addition, claim 1 now explains that the display panel portion is detachably mounted on a device body portion of said electronic equipment, said storage part is contained in said display panel portion of said electronic equipment, and writing of display data into said storage part is enabled when said display panel is detached from the device body portion of said electronic equipment.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Beckert does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, as newly-amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the additionally cited reference to Berstis, applied under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in combination with Beckert against claims 10, 18 and 19, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to Beckert.

Also, while they have not been repeated herein, Applicants respectfully submit that arguments included in the unentered Amendment document filed on May 17, 2006 in this application are still relevant and applicable in support of the patentability of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: August 21, 2006

By:

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465